



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,291	12/17/2001	Kimberly DaShawn Simon	AUS920010993US1	5596

7590 11/10/2004

Joseph T. Van Leeuwen
P.O. Box 81641
Austin, TX 78708-1641

EXAMINER

ALI, MOHAMMAD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,291

Applicant(s)

SIMON ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad Ali

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2167

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on June 25, 2004.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2167

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar et al. ('Kumar' hereinafter), US Patent 6,697,810 in view of Walter Lindsay ('Lindsay' hereinafter), US Patent 6,694,338.

With respect to claim 1,

Kumar discloses a method for analyzing database security (see Figs. 22 and 33), said method comprising:

connecting to one or more servers , wherein each server includes an instance, the instance including one or more databases (see col. 8, lines 24-34, Fig. 1) ;

selecting one of the databases (see col. 12, lines 60-63);

identifying a user id, wherein the user id has access to the selected databases (see col. 12, lines 60-63);

retrieving a permitted user id list corresponding to the selected database (see col. 10, lines 1-10, Fig. 2 et seq);

determining whether the user id is included in the permitted user id list (see col. 32, lines 55-65, Fig. 33);

reporting the user id in response to the determining (see col. 19, lines 55-59, Fig. 19).

Kumar does not explicitly indicate the claimed step of "instance".

Lindsay discloses the claimed step of instance (see col. 2, lines 51-53).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references,

Art Unit: 2167

because instance of Lindsay's teachings would have allowed Kumar system for document using meta-data associated with the first document by Lindsay, see col. 2, lines 4-5.

As to claim 2,

Kumar teaches retrieving a resolution corresponding to the determining (see col. 10, lines 1-10, Fig. 2 et seq); and including the resolution in the reporting (see col. 19, lines 55-59, Fig. 19).

As to claim 3,

Kumar teaches identifying a violation message type wherein the violation message type is selected from the group consisting of a removed users check, a DB files and logs access check, and a DB backup files and logs access check (see col. 19, lines 55-59, Figs. 19, 37, Abstract).

As to claim 4,

Kumar teaches wherein the database is selected from a group consisting of a database, a backup database, and a directory of databases (see col. 12, lines 60-63 et seq).

As to claim 5,

Kumar teaches wherein the connection is secure (see col. 8, lines 24-34, Figs. 1, 22, 33).

As to claim 6,

Kumar teaches wherein the permitted user id list is selected from the group consisting of a database instance owner, a sysadm group, and a sysmaint group (see col. 19, lines 55-59, Fig. 27 and Abstract).

Art Unit: 2167

As to claim 7,

Kumar teaches wherein the servers are on different operating platforms (see col. 32, 13-27 et seq).

Claim 8 has same subject matter as of claim 1 except one or more processors; a memory accessible by the processors; one or more non-volatile storage devices accessible by the processors and Kumar discloses at col. 44, lines 32-34 and col. 38, lines 17-24, Fig. 37 et seq and essentially rejected for the same reasons as described above.

Kumar does not explicitly indicate the claimed step of "instance".

Lindsay discloses the claimed step of instance (see col. 2, lines 51-53).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references, because instance of Lindsay's teachings would have allowed Kumar system for document using meta-data associated with the first document by Lindsay, see col. 2, lines 4-5.

As to claim 9,

Kumar teaches retrieving a resolution corresponding to the determining (see col. 10, lines 1-10, Fig. 2 et seq); and including the resolution in the reporting (see col. 19, lines 55-59, Fig. 19).

As to claim 10,

Kumar teaches identifying a violation message type wherein the violation message type is selected from the group consisting of a removed users check, a

Art Unit: 2167

DB files and logs access check, and a DB backup files and logs access check (see col. 19, lines 55-59, Figs. 19, 37 and Abstract).

As to claim 11,

Kumar teaches wherein the database is selected from a group consisting of a database, a backup database, and a directory of databases (see col. 12, lines 60-63 et seq).

As to claim 12,

Kumar teaches wherein the permitted user id list is selected from the group consisting of a database instance owner, a sysadm group, and a sysmaint group (see col. 32, lines 55-65, Fig. 33).

As to claim 13,

Kumar teaches wherein the servers are on different operating platforms (see col. 32, 13-27 et seq).

Claim 14 has same subject matter as of claim 1 and 8 except a computer program product stored in a computer operable media for analyzing database security, said computer program product (see Fig. 37 and col. 8, lines 25-35 and col. 38, lines 17-24 et seq and essentially rejected for the same reasons as described above.

Kumar does not explicitly indicate the claimed step of "instance".

Lindsay discloses the claimed step of instance (see col. 2, lines 51-53).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the data processing art, at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references, because instance of Lindsay's teachings would have allowed Kumar system for

Art Unit: 2167

document using meta-data associated with the first document by Lindsay, see col. 1, lines 4-5.

As to claim 15,

Kumar teaches retrieving a resolution corresponding to the determining (see col. 10, lines 1-10, Fig. 2 et seq); and including the resolution in the reporting (see col. 19, lines 55-59, Fig. 19).

As to claim 16,

Kumar teaches identifying a violation message type wherein the violation message type is selected from the group consisting of a removed users check, a DB files and logs access check, and a DB backup files and logs access check (see col. 12, lines 60-63, Fig. 37 et seq).

As to claim 17,

Kumar teaches wherein the database is selected from a group consisting of a database, a backup database, and a directory of databases (see col. 12, lines 60-63).

As to claim 18,

Kumar teaches wherein the connection is secure (see col. 8, lines 24-34, Fig. 1).

As to claim 19,

Kumar teaches wherein the permitted user id list is selected from the group consisting of a database instance owner, a sysadm group, and a sysmaint group (see col. 32, lines 55-65, Fig. 33).

As to claim 20,

Art Unit: 2167

Kumar teaches wherein the servers are on different operating platforms
(see col. 32, 13-27 et seq).

Art Unit: 2167

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (571) 272-4105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for any communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

MA

October 27, 2004



Mohammad Ali

Primary Patent Examiner

Art Unit: 2177